

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMISSION ON MERCHANT  
MARINE AND DEFENSE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 15 in Jacksonville, FL, Adm. J.L. Holloway III, U.S. Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations, spoke to many of the maritime industry under the leadership of the Propeller Club. I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from his speech which are important for us all and the future of our Nation. As a former Chief of Naval Operations and a man now in a leadership capacity in the maritime industry of our country, and as a member of the Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense, Admiral Holloway is particularly and eminently equipped to speak on these matters.

Excerpts from the speech follow:

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL J.L. HOLLOWAY III, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

On the 19th of October, 1987 the Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense, better known as the Bennett Commission, met with President Reagan in the Oval office to present their first report—The Findings of Fact and Conclusions.

The sense of this report is probably best reflected in the very first conclusion, quote: "The Commission has found clear and growing danger to the national security in the deteriorating condition of America's maritime industries. The United States cannot consider its own interest for freedom secure, much less retain a position of leadership in the free world, without reversing the decline of the maritime industries of this nation, which would depend so heavily in a protracted war upon adequate use of oceans for its military defense and for its economic survival."

I am sure that these words are not surprising to most of you here tonight. They describe a situation that many of us have been concerned about for some time. Their special significance however, is that they represent the carefully studied views of the Congressionally mandated and Presidentially appointed Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense.

In 1982, the Office of Management and Budget—OMB—prepared a staff review of Maritime Programs and Policy for the Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade. One of its main conclusions was that national security arguments do not provide a strong justification for the provision of public assistance to the maritime industries.

This conclusion was based on several critically flawed assumptions concerning the national military policy—that the United States would escalate to a general nuclear exchange after thirty days of a general war with the Soviet Union, and that there would be plenty of commercial shipping available for the limited sealift needs of a short war. In spite of criticisms, the OMB staff review became established as the philosophy of the

Administration's position in matters concerning the maritime industry. However in 1984 this Commission was established by Congress to review the facts and support on what should be done.

In a series of six public hearings, the Commissioners heard representatives from virtually every interest group in the maritime business, including the shippers. At the same time, officials from the Administration and the Services were meeting with the Commission in a series of give and take sessions in which all aspects of the issues were discussed.

The national security strategy of the United States is a collective forward defense. This forward strategy uses the oceans as barriers for our defense and as avenues for extending influence abroad. It exploits the principle that in a general war, we intend to engage an enemy closer to his borders than to ours. This forward strategy depends upon overseas allies, forward deployed military forces and the strategic mobility to respond to crises around the world.

Sealift is absolutely essential to the success of this military strategy. There is no plan for any major overseas military operation, whether it be a general war involving the Soviet Union, or a contingency operation in some remote corner of the globe, that does not involve the use of the seas for projecting and sustaining American military forces.

Today the United States maintains four Army Divisions in West Germany, another in South Korea, and a Marine Division in Japan. Forty-two of our forty-four allies are overseas. In addition, there are fifteen active Army and Marine Divisions located in the Continental United States. If they are to join battle with an enemy, they must be transported overseas.

In time of war, these forward deployed forces and our allies must be reinforced and resupplied, and most of this logistic support will move by sea. Admiral Crowe, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that sealift will deliver about 95% of all dry cargo and 99% of all petroleum products. This overwhelming reliance on sealift is understandable when one considers the enormous quantities of war materiel demanded by the mobility and firepower of modern ground forces. For example, more than 100,000 tons of cargo are required to deploy a single mechanized Division. When overseas that Division will need more than 1,000 tons per day delivered to sustain it in operation.

Airlift is planned for the rapid movement of troops to join up with prepositioned equipment, and for the fast delivery of small amounts of critical supplies and materiel. But airlift is severely limited in terms of its ability to move outsized equipment, and in the total volume that can be lifted. A large part of the organic equipment of modern armies, such as helicopters and tank retrievers, will not fit in most aircraft. One modern container ship can carry the equivalent cargo of 150 C-5 aircraft. Also, airlift is

a notorious consumer of fuel. According to the JCS, during the 1973 Yom Kippur war, our airlift support for Israel required six tons of aviation fuel for every ton of military cargo delivered in Tel Aviv.

In recognition of the importance of sealift, the Secretary of the Navy announced in May of 1984 that the major functions of the U.S. Navy were being expanded to include strategic sealift as a third major function, joining sea control and power projection, which for years had been the two functional bases for naval force requirements.

In a general war with the Soviet Union, the United States can expect substantial sealift help from the merchant fleets of our allies: Japan, Korea, and the NATO countries.

For the deployment of U.S. forces into Southwest Asia in a contingency operation, the United States must depend upon U.S.-flag shipping. History has consistently demonstrated that our allies are not going to participate in unilateral U.S. military operations, and current events in the Persian Gulf have again confirmed the lack of support we can expect from our allies in this theater, and the need for the United States to be able to go it alone. It has reemphasized the need for us to have enough American flag shipping to carry out specific military contingency operations such as a deployment of the U.S. Central Command to the Indian Ocean.

Only four years ago a new unified command, the Central Command, similar in organizational and regional responsibility to CINCEUR and CINCPAC, was created to cover the Indian Ocean littoral from Kenya to Pakistan, extending inward to embrace the Israeli-Arab confrontation states. Five Army and Marine Divisions are earmarked for this Command, but all are located in the United States. That is where CENTCOM differs from CINCPAC and CINCEUR. If the Central Command were to be deployed, all of its forces would have to be moved from the United States to the Indian Ocean area.

And that creates a massive problem, we don't have enough U.S. flag shipping. The Commission states in one of its most important conclusions: "There is today, insufficient strategic sealift, both ships and trained personnel, for the United States, using only its own resources as required by defense planning assumptions, to execute a major deployment in a contingency operation in a single distant theater such as Southwest Asia. Without decisive action, the situation will worsen substantially by the year 2000."

This shortfall in cargo ships is mainly the result of the decline in the American merchant fleet, which has decreased from 843 ships in 1970 to 369 today. The reduction in the size of the American merchant marine is considered to be especially critical by defense planners, because of a serious side effect. As the commercial fleet shrinks, the pool of mariners available to man the Ready Reserve Force is progressively eliminated.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The Commission was equally concerned with the decline of our shipbuilding and repair industry. Since 1982, 76 American shipyards have closed and more than 52,000 members of the workforce have gone away. The impact on our mobilization planning is serious. In time of war, our shipyards must have the additional capacity to break-out the ready reserve fleet, to accelerate the overhaul and production of naval ships, to repair battle damage and provide replacements for combat losses.

The shipbuilding and repair industry simply cannot maintain a mobilization base adequate to these tasks depending upon naval construction work alone. There needs to be an augmentation of commercial work in our shipyards. The Commission concluded that:

"The base of shipyards and repair facilities, and their industrial suppliers is currently inadequate in that sense and is continuing to deteriorate at an alarmingly progressive rate. Maintaining the shipbuilding and repair segment of the industrial base required to sustain a protracted general war is essential to deterring or winning such a war."

The ability of the United States to sustain a protracted long term conventional conflict with the Soviets, although essentially ignored by the OMB staff review, is a matter of deep concern at the national level of defense policy planners. Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger recently stated to the Congress,

"It goes without saying that should our policy to deter aggression fail and a conventional conflict be forced upon us, the United States would bend every effort to win the war as quickly as possible. The essential purpose of our readiness for conventional warfare is to prevent war by deterring aggression. Deterrence would be weakened if the enemy were misled to believe that he could easily outlast us in a conventional war if we were unprepared to sustain the conflict, the adversary might expect we would have to seek a truce by conceding vital territory to his control. The efforts that I have initiated to overcome the short war fallacy—improve sustained ability for U.S. forces, a strength and capability to expand defense production, and appropriate changes in the strategy and tactics—are essential to reduce the likelihood of war."

This first report of the Bennett Commission is only the initial step in what is hoped will be a successful program to correct major deficiencies in our national security posture.

Ultimately its Recommendations must be enacted into legislation and translated into new policies and directives. For this to happen, there must be support within key agencies and from responsible officials within our Government. I believe that support will be there. It was encouraging to hear the words of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral William J. Crowe, U.S. Navy, who said, quote:

"The decline in the size and capacity of the U.S. merchant marine has been a major concern of DOD national security planners. However, in its present diminished state, it remains an integral element of our preparedness for war and a critical pillar of deterrence. In this era of constrained resources, if there were no U.S.-flag merchant marine, it would have to be replaced by a government-owned and operated sealift fleet—at considerable additional expense to acquire and operate."

But it does seem ironic that during these past few years of the accelerated decline of

the American maritime industries, our need for maritime forces has actually increased. A new U.S. military Command has been created in the Indian Ocean with no American combatant ground forces in the theater, as there are in the Atlantic, Pacific and European Commands. The operating forces of this new Central Command will have to be deployed into the area, along with their equipment and support, and more than 90% will have to go by sea. Even as these new responsibilities for U.S. presence in the most remote regions of the world are being created, the overseas base structure available to American forces are experiencing a sharp decline. Gone is our base structure in Southeast Asia, we are being asked to remove our land-based tactical air forces from Spain; access to other NATO bases for unilateral U.S. military operations is questionable; and there is deep concern for the future availability of our major bases in the Philippines.

In contrast, one cannot help but observe the continuing growth of the Soviet navy, which includes their merchant marine, in both numbers and quality. From a small fleet of absolete cargo ships, Morflot, the Russian merchant marine, has grown into a modern, efficient, technologically advanced commercial fleet, specifically designed to support Soviet national objectives. This transformation, spanning less than two decades, was not left to the chance vagaries of international ocean trade. It was clearly a commitment by the USSR to create a commercial ocean-going fleet that would satisfy the Soviet's military, foreign policy, and trade objectives. This Soviet commitment is especially interesting when the geopolitical situation of Russia is considered: Historically a major Eurasian land power, with the People's Republic of China to the East, and its Warsaw Pact allies on its western border, the Soviets can defend themselves from the Chinese, support their Warsaw Pact allies, and invade NATO without ever crossing a major body of water.

The Russians clearly understand the importance of seapower.

However, I am convinced that as a result of the Bennett Commission, and with the constant efforts of the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, under this chairmanship of Congressman Charles Bennett, there will be a wider national awareness and a better understanding of the importance of our maritime industries and the need to solve the problems that beset them. This nation simply must continue to make progress in strengthening our traditional maritime posture.

**FORMER AMBASSADOR JEANE KIRKPATRICK VIEWS TIBETANS AS "SECOND CLASS CITIZENS IN THEIR OWN HOMELAND"**

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place into the RECORD an article by former United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick about the plight of Tibetans under Chinese rule in their own country. The Tibetans suffer, she says, as a direct result of political violence used against unarmed people. I think it is a

succinct explanation of the situation in Tibet. The article, which ran in the Washington Post on December 21, 1987, follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 21, 1987]

**"SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS IN THEIR OWN HOMELAND"**

(By Jeane Kirkpatrick)

It is the season of the neediest cases. In cities all over America, attention is focused on those with especially terrible problems in the expectation that the rest of us will offer sympathy and help as we undertake our celebrations.

It is just as good a time to look at the world's neediest cases—places like Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Cambodia and Tibet—where millions suffer chronic hunger, exile, repression, separation from family and hardship beyond belief.

Unlike suffering rooted in the human condition (illness, old age, loss of loved ones) or in the failure of social policies (poverty, unemployment, homelessness), the misery of Ethiopians, Afghans, Cambodians, Tibetans is a direct result of political violence used by governments against unarmed people.

Ethiopian President Mengistu Haile Mariam employs violence against helpless hordes of Eritreans whom he is determined to conquer; Vietnam's government employs violence against the Cambodians who survived Pol Pot's murderous utopia (only to fall victim to invasion and occupation); Soviet armies employ violence against the fierce but battered Afghans; and the People's Republic of China employs violence against the long-suffering people of Tibet.

In each case a foreign government uses force to subdue an ethnically and culturally distinct people. In each case conquest and the denial of self-determination have served as preface to the denial of most of the rights protected by the International Declaration of Human Rights. In each case the effort to conquer a people has led to suppression, dispersion, relocation, massive disruption of the social structure—and mass murder.

Conquest is not a memory from history books. It is happening now as these modern (Communist) governments use force against unarmed populations.

What is called the "international community" does precious little for the victims of these violent policies. Food aid is provided to Ethiopians under an unspoken rule of silence about the causes of their man-made famine. Some governments (including the United States) provide assistance to "freedom fighters" who struggle against the occupations of Cambodia and Afghanistan, and each year the United Nations General Assembly passes discreet resolutions calling for the withdrawal of "foreign" troops from these lands.

Even less notice is taken of the quiet, non-violent people of Tibet, whose land and culture are victims of a determined campaign of destruction and transformation. The "international community" remained silent even after this fall's executions and repressions laid bare the brute force on which China's policies for Tibet depend.

Though doggedly "Chinese" in its perspective on the region, even the Far East Bureau of the State Department has recently affirmed in testimony before Congress "the depredations and massive violations of basic human rights perpetrated against the Tibetan people since the entry of the People's Liberation Army into the area of Tibet in 1950."

Even the State Department does not deny China's determined efforts to eradicate Tibet's language, culture and religions. Department spokesmen understand the terrible Tibetan toll of forced collectivization and disastrous agricultural policies in the '60s. They know, too, that the Cultural Revolution made Buddhist Tibet a special target of its campaign. All religious institutions were attacked, religious monuments destroyed, monks murdered and 100,000 Tibetans driven into exile in Bhutan, Nepal and India.

It is estimated that more than a million Tibetans—nearly one-sixth of the total population—have died as a result of China's policies. Some 6,000 monasteries have been destroyed. Tibetan children have been removed from their families for "education" in China. Occupation armies have been permanently stationed in Tibet.

With the onset of liberalization in China, Hu Yao Bang made a public apology and announced new policies for Tibet. Tibetans were allowed to rebuild certain monasteries and to worship in them. But the practice and study of religion remain severely restricted by law, and now Yu Yao Bang himself has been purged.

Meanwhile, a deliberate massive resettlement program has attracted millions of Chinese into Tibet, where they enjoy unusually high wages and good living conditions. Today Chinese outnumber Tibetans in their own homeland (some 7.5 million to 6 million). Tibetans suffer systematic discrimination and segregation. The per-capita income of Tibetans is one-third that of the Chinese. Their life expectancy is 20 years below the Chinese average. The Tibetans literacy rate is far lower, their health poorer, their housing more primitive. As the Dalai Lama notes, the Chinese government has made Tibetans "second class citizens in their own homeland."

That government and its apologists explain the Tibetan suffering as the more or less normal consequence of modernization of a "semi-feudal theocracy," which is what they call Tibet. But it is not so. Tibet's miseries are a consequence of repression, not of modernization. Modernization builds on existing cultures. It does not destroy them.

This fall, when Tibetan demonstrations were harshly repressed and public executions held to intimidate Tibetans, the U.S. Congress understood better than the State Department the moral imperatives for American solidarity with Tibetans, who seek nothing more than the human rights our foreign policy affirms for all people.

By overwhelming votes, both houses of Congress expressed their concern over human rights violations in Tibet and affirmed the rights of Tibetans to democratic freedoms.

Now, in the season of Hanukkah and Christmas, the rest of us should find ways to express our solidarity with Tibet's struggle.

The campaign to let Poland be Poland and its accompanying sanctions have helped the Poles in their hour of greatest need. Surely now a determined American government can find ways to help the peaceful people of Tibet be Tibetan.

## TRIBUTE TO MR. JACK REEL

### HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand before you to pay tribute to Mr. Jack Reel of Ohio.

Mr. Reel is a reflection of what this great Nation is all about. He was born on a farm in 1940 and graduated from Austintown-Fitch High School in 1939. He later married Vada May and they now live on the farm where he was born.

Jack entered the Army on August 12, 1942, and attended Officer Candidate School at Fort Sill, OK. He served in the Philippines during World War II and was part of the occupation forces in Japan. He had reached the position of lieutenant when he left the Army.

Jack is a member of the Smith Corners Methodist Church and is a former Sunday school teacher and superintendent. He has not missed a Sunday worship for 25 years. For 26 years he has been a 4-H Club leader and advisory committee officer. He spent 11 years as a chairman to the county extension advisory committee and has been the deputy master of the Mahoning County Granges since 1969.

His list of accomplishments and volunteer work is more than impressive. I am proud to represent such a fine citizen. May his giving and generosity continue. All of us in the Mahoning Valley are proud of Jack Reel and I am honored to pay tribute to this hard working and compassionate man.

## THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION REPORT ON KOREAN ELECTIONS

### HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the presidential election of December 16 marks a long stride forward for the people of the Republic of South Korea. Despite many expressions of fear—by foreigners and Koreans alike—that the election would be marred by violence or fraud, it proceeded calmly and soberly. It would seem that the Korean people are satisfied that the election was honest, as well.

Despite his repeated predictions that fraud would be systematic, and his spokesman's explicit warning that blood would flow as a result, one of the opposition candidates, Kim Dae-Jung, has since admitted that his failure to unite with other opposition forces permitted Democratic Justice Party candidate Roe Tae Woo a victory. The likelihood that the opposition would be doomed by their divisions was a subject much discussed by Koreans prior to the balloting.

Indeed, writing as early as August 26, 1985, in the Asian Wall Street Journal Weekly, Heritage Foundation analyst Daryl Plunk stressed the deep divisions between Kim Dae-Jung and Kim Young Sam and declared that "the politi-

cal opposition in South Korea is at a crossroads." The two Kims failed to take the same path, and the opposition divided behind them.

What matters in 1988 is that President-elect Roh Tae Woo, victorious by a margin of nearly 2 million votes, continue to give evidence of the realism and magnanimity toward the opposition that he demonstrated during his brief candidacy. The movement toward democracy has been most impressive, and will most likely get another push from the upcoming elections for the national assembly.

The U.S. administration's policy has been to press the ROK on human rights questions and urge its government toward democracy while disdaining the occasional call from individual Members of Congress for sanctions. I judge that we have reason to be satisfied with the policy; it has had its small part in the progress of the South Koreans toward full political freedom. And, as Heritage analysts Richard D. Fisher, Jr., and Daryl M. Plunk conclude in their report on the elections, "A more democratic South Korea would enhance its already close ties with the United States and also contribute to Asian stability."

The Heritage Foundation "Executive Memo" follows:

## AFTER SOUTH KOREA'S ELECTIONS, RECONCILIATION IS THE NEXT STEP TOWARD DEMOCRACY

(Updating Asian Study Center Background No. 64, "Confronting Political Change in South Korea," June 2, 1987.)

A new political era is dawning in the Republic of Korea. Last week's South Korean presidential election may be the country's most significant progress in political development since its formation in 1948. As the result of a fair and open electoral process, witnessed by many international observers including the authors of this paper, President-elect Roh Tae Woo, nominee of the ruling Democratic Justice Party, will be sworn in next February 26. This will mark the first peaceful transfer of executive power in South Korean history. Also inaugurated on that day will be a new and more democratic constitution drafted by all the major political parties.

Now that South Koreans have demonstrated that they can conduct honest elections, the next test for the country's fledgling democracy is for the defeated candidates—mainly Kim Young Sam of the Reunification Democratic Party and Kim Dae Jung of the Peace and Democracy Party—to show their readiness to concede peacefully. Both Kims have been charging, without producing proof, that the government rigged the election. Initially both Kims hinted that they might organize street demonstrations to show their opposition, but there have been increasing indications that both may soon accept the judgment of their countrymen.

## DRAMATIC TURNAROUND

That the election proceeded peacefully was a change from the turbulent days of last June when hordes of often violent street demonstrators called for constitutional revision and a direct presidential election. They claimed that the existing indirect electoral college system was unfair. Roh Tae Woo, head of the ruling party, bowed to the pressure and on June 29 accepted virtually all the opposition demands. Within weeks the national legislature passed the new law

that covered last week's election. It also approved the new constitution.

On election eve, December 15, most Korean and foreign observers believed that the race was too close to call. It turned out not to be close at all. Roh won 36 percent of the vote, with Kim Young Sam and Kim Dae Jung trailing with 27 and 26 percent respectively. Minor candidates accounted for the remaining votes. Roh's margin of victory was nearly two million of the 23 million votes cast. To be sure, there were isolated instances of voting irregularities ranging from allegations of vote buying to intimidation of official poll watchers. Charges have been leveled at both government and opposition camps. The Kims have not, however, offered firm evidence to substantiate their claims of "massive election fraud."

In keeping with the election law drafted by all major political parties, the election process was protected by an elaborate system of checks and balances. Observers from competing political parties were present at all stages of the election, from vote casting to ballot counting. An official of the U.S. embassy in Seoul commented on the day before the vote that "election procedures are very tight" and any "significant fraud would be highly vulnerable to exposure."

#### NO EVIDENCE OF FRAUD.

Reminiscent of international interest in last year's Filipino election, at least four U.S. observer teams traveled to South Korea. None of the American groups, including that sponsored by the pro-opposition Council for Democracy in Korea, reported any compelling proof of widespread election rigging. This was mirrored by comments to the Congress by Assistant Secretary of State Gaston Sigur that there is "no evidence of systematic fraud" and that the South Korean election "appears to have been conducted in an open and orderly manner." This position has received bipartisan congressional support, including that of the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Stephen Solarz, the New York Democrat.

The next step in building South Korean democracy must be reconciliation and compromise by the three main candidates. President-elect Roh already has said that he is ready to start reconciliation talks with opposition leaders. The ability of all sides to cooperate will be tested in early 1988 when a new election law must be written for upcoming National Assembly elections.

#### CHALLENGES AHEAD.

Future elections are just one of many challenges facing the new government. Others include resolving the growing trade friction with the U.S. and seeking to improve relations with North Korea, which continues to pose a real military threat. Possible North Korean involvement in the destruction near Thailand of Korean Air flight 858 on November 29 reminds all South Koreans of the potential danger from the North. Also of great national importance are the upcoming 1988 Seoul Summer Olympic Games.

Washington can help its Korean ally by continuing its hands-off policy toward South Korean domestic politics. Koreans themselves are meeting the challenge of democratization. The Reagan Administration was wise to ignore the handful of liberal members of Congress who earlier this year proposed drastic U.S. measures against Seoul, including economic sanctions, to force South Korean democratic reforms.

What the U.S. must do is to continue urging both sides to reconcile their differences. This would ensure that South Koreans continue making progress in the political arena commensurate with their impressive economic success. A more democratic South Korea would enhance its already close ties with the U.S. and also contribute to Asian stability.

RICHARD D. FISHER, Jr.,  
Policy Analyst.  
DARYL M. PLUNK,  
Visiting Fellow.

### TRIBUTE TO RICHARD W. MITCHELL

#### HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding New Yorker from Poughkeepsie, Richard W. Mitchell. Dick is stepping down from his post as president of the Poughkeepsie Area Chamber of Commerce after nearly 18 years of service. Dick has been a catalyst for the entire community of Dutchess County in a period of unprecedented growth, and a valued friend to me.

For three decades, Dick has played an integral part in both the private and public sectors of the Hudson Valley. Serving as mayor of the city of Poughkeepsie from 1965-69, Dick supported Federal urban renewal for the area. He mastered its details and demonstrated skill and knowledge in negotiating with federal officials. That program initially drew criticism because much of the land that was cleared under the program was not developed for years. However, had there not been an urban renewal program in the sixties, the cost of revitalizing the innercity in subsequent years would have been astronomical. It was that type of foresight that distinguished Dick Mitchell's public career.

The summer of 1967 brought 3 days of racial disturbances to Poughkeepsie. A lesser man might have panicked, but Dick was able to help diffuse the situation and avoid the violence experienced by other cities. He had the right attributes to handle an explosive moment—patience, compassion and fairness.

Dick's second term saw needed development to Poughkeepsie's infrastructure, specifically an arterial system, though again he met with opposition. There was no easy way to improve the roads and meet the growing transportation needs of the community. Several houses had to be destroyed and the complexion of many neighborhoods changed. Such are the growing pains associated with any city revitalization. Tough decisions had to be made and Dick made them.

After leaving public office, Dick intended to return to the family business, the Mitchell Furniture Co. He had served as president of the company before taking on the job as mayor. Unfortunately, a fire devastated the business, and forced Dick to look for work elsewhere.

The Poughkeepsie Area Chamber of Commerce was fortunate to procure Dick's services, and he has served as its president for two decades. In that time, the membership

has tripled and the chamber has gained widespread notoriety.

In his capacity as chamber president, Dick Mitchell has been a guiding hand in the development of the city of Poughkeepsie. The city in many ways is a monument to his foresight and tireless involvement.

Dick was also instrumental in organizing my annual Chamber of Commerce Day in Washington, which I have hosted with Congressman BEN GILMAN for the last 12 years. Members from the various chambers in our districts travel to Washington for a day-long program of speakers and discussion on Federal programs and current affairs. Every year our program has become bigger and better. Again, thanks to Dick's help.

I wish Dick and his lovely wife Wanda, all the best in the future. His service to the Hudson Valley has guided us wisely through many turbulent years. I consider myself lucky to have worked with him, and I am proud he is my friend. Good luck Dick.

### DAV RESPONDS TO SPATE OF EDITORIALS AGAINST UP-GRADING THE VA

#### HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 27, I submitted for the record a statement by Mr. Butch Joeckel, executive director of the Washington office of the Disabled American Veterans, expressing his views on the media opposition to the effort to upgrade the Veterans' Administration to a Cabinet-level department.

Mr. Joeckel's letter to me of January 6, 1988, which was inadvertently omitted from my submission last Wednesday, follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,  
Washington, DC, January 6, 1988.

Hon. G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONTGOMERY: The Washington Post printed four editorials in about one month against the pending legislation that would elevate the VA to Cabinet level. Yesterday, the Post printed an op-ed piece by former Agriculture Secretary John Block that also opposes Cabinet status for the VA.

Mr. Block touts himself as an active veteran. But after graduating from West Point in 1957, Mr. Block resigned from the Army in 1960 to pursue his private fortune. Apart from the fact that 3 years of military service hardly repays the Government for 4 expensive years of an Academy education, Mr. Block's minimal service occurred exclusively in time of peace.

Mr. Block's lack of wartime experience undermines his credibility on a fundamental aspect of the Cabinet proposal as a bridge between veterans of wars divided by a generation. The Post, too, seems insensitive to this issue, as pointed out in the enclosed manuscript that we submitted but which the Post refused to print.

We would appreciate your printing both this letter and the enclosed manuscript in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an effort to

insure an audience for what we believe is an important pro-Cabinet idea.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. JOECKEL, JR.,  
Executive Director.

# ELIMINATE TAX EXEMPT FINANCING AND DEPRECIATION FOR JAPANESE CONSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce legislation to deny depreciation for tax purposes and the use of tax exempt bonds to finance buildings constructed with Japanese engineering or architectural services.

Japan has consistently refused to allow foreign firms to participate fully in Japanese construction projects. Although the United States has had open construction markets for years, allowing foreign nations to compete for construction jobs in the United States, Japan has had restrictions on construction bidding which kept foreign bidders out of the Japanese market.

Under the Japanese construction practices, contractors are chosen from a select group of bidders. To get on the list of bidders, a company must first be licensed, and the Japanese will only grant a license to companies with Japanese experience, a catch 22 situation if ever there was one! As a result, United States companies have not been able to break into Japan's \$200 billion a year construction market.

Meanwhile, the Japanese construction firms have aggressively penetrated the United States construction market. While Japanese construction firms had less than \$50 million of the United States construction market in 1981, Japanese market share for United States construction projects by 1987 was approximately \$3 billion.

The closed Japanese market has contributed to our trade imbalance with Japan, now running about \$4.9 billion a month. This trade imbalance costs American workers jobs: each billion dollars of trade deficit results in 10,000 lost American jobs.

Congress has begun to correct this situation. In the recently passed continuing appropriations bill, we approved a measure which prohibited the Federal Government from procuring construction services for United States public works projects from Japanese firms during fiscal year 1988. In 1987, Japan's share of the United States public works market was \$100 million.

Now, it is appropriate to make similar restraints for Japanese construction firms bidding on private sector United States construction jobs. By eliminating tax exempt financing and depreciation for Japanese construction in the United States, we will at least reduce our trade imbalance while we resume negotiations with the Japanese.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3888

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

## SECTION 1. DENIAL OF DEPRECIATION.

Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to depreciation) is amended by redesignating subsection (r) as subsection (s) and by inserting after subsection (q) the following new subsection:

"(r) DENIAL OF DEPRECIATION FOR BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTED WITH JAPANESE SERVICES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no deduction for depreciation or amortization shall be allowed for any building if 1 percent or more of the cost of such building (determined as of the completion of its construction) is attributable to services performed by Japanese persons.

"(2) JAPANESE PERSON.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'Japanese person' means—

"(A) any citizen or national of Japan,

"(B) any corporation, partnership, or other entity created or organized under the laws of Japan or any subdivision thereof,

"(C) any instrumentality of Japan or a subdivision thereof, and

"(D) any corporation, partnership, or other entity owned or controlled (directly or indirectly) by 1 or more persons or entities described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)."

## SEC. 2. DENIAL OF USE OF TAX-EXEMPT BONDS.

Section 149 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED WITH JAPANESE SERVICES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in section 103(a) or any other provision of law shall be construed to provide an exemption from Federal income tax for interest on any bond issued as part of an issue 1 percent or more of the proceeds of which are to be used to provide Japanese constructed facilities.

"(2) JAPANESE CONSTRUCTED FACILITY.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'Japanese constructed facility' means any facility if 1 percent or more of the cost of such facility (determined as of the completion of its construction) is attributable to services performed by Japanese persons (as defined in section 167(r)(3))."

## SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 shall apply to property the construction of which begins after December 31, 1987.

## MARCH OF FOLLY

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD the following article by Wayne S. Smith from the January 29 New York Times so that Congress will not miss the opportunity to halt the "march of folly" led by the administration in its pursuit of further Contra aid. Despite Nicaragua's willingness to negotiate their differences with the United States, including the United States concern regarding a Soviet buildup, the administration continues to ask for support to the Contras. The Congress should consider in what way U.S. foreign policy objectives are best achieved in the

Central American region. I think Dr. Smith is on the right track.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1988]

## THE "MARCH OF FOLLY" IN FURTHER CONTRA AID

(By Wayne S. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—In her classic book, "The March of Folly," the historian Barbara Tuchman notes the compulsion of national leaders all through history to behave woodenly—that is, to follow policies contrary to those indicated by good sense and enlightened self-interest. Calling Philip II of Spain "the surpassing woodenhead of all sovereigns," she observes, "No experience of the failure of his policy could shake his belief in its essential excellence."

Philip's title is now on the line. In seven years' time, our policy of aiding the contras has produced only Irangate, national humiliation and the condemnation of the United States by the World Court—to say nothing of the suffering it has caused in Nicaragua. The contras cannot defeat the Sandinistas; they can only harass them, and harassment advances no discernible objective of the United States.

And yet, still convinced of the essential excellence of his policy, President Reagan has now asked the Congress for \$36 million in contra aid, including \$3.6 million in delayed military aid.

How does the President justify this request? By warning, in his State of the Union Message, that while the Sandinistas talk of peace, they and the Soviet Union are planning a large-scale military buildup—which presumably only contra aid can stop.

In fact, it is quite the other way around. As President Daniel Ortega Saavedra made clear in an article on the Op-Ed page of The New York Times on Jan. 14, there will be no augmentation of Nicaraguan forces if the plan authored by President Oscar Arias Sanchez of Nicaragua works. Indeed, they could then be reduced.

True, as reported by the Nicaragua defector, Maj. Roger Miranda, Moscow and Managua have discussed both the possible creation of a militia of 600,000 members and Nicaragua's acquisition of more sophisticated weapons. But as Nicaraguan documents that he turned over to Washington indicated, the determinate in any such upgrading would be "a sustained escalation of America aggression via a mercenary war and the continuing threat of a large-scale military action on the part of the United States."

Both in his article and in a subsequent letter to President Reagan, President Ortega urged that rather than permitting things to come to such a pass, the United States and Nicaragua negotiate their differences, and he emphasized Nicaragua's willingness to address United States security concerns.

President Reagan, of course, did not mention any of this in his State of the Union Message. That would have been embarrassing, for it would have contradicted his assertion that the Sandinistas were saying one thing and doing another, and it would also have raised questions about why Mr. Reagan, in spite of his expressed concern over a Soviet buildup, so recklessly rejected overtures that addressed that concern.

Perhaps President Reagan considers negotiations with little Nicaragua to be beneath his dignity. But what of discussions with the Soviet Union? During the summit meeting, Mikhail S. Gorbachev suggested that both sides support the Arias plan—the United

States by ending aid to the contras, the Soviet Union by severely limiting any military shipments to Nicaragua.

If the President was worried about a Soviet buildup, here was a golden opportunity to head it off. But did the President seize the opportunity? Of course not! He did not even bother to respond.

Rather, he waited until Mr. Gorbachev was out of town and then began ringing alarm bells over the Miranda allegations as part of his scare tactics to get more contra aid.

He continued ringing them during his State of Union Message. It is an all too familiar pattern: Negotiations that might achieve our objectives are eschewed in favor of continued aid to the contras, who haven't a chance of achieving any of them. Philip II would have been envious.

The President also continues to insist that only by continuing aid to the contras can we hope to return democracy to Nicaragua. In fact, such aid has as little chance of encouraging democracy in Nicaragua as the President's economic policies did of balancing the Federal budget.

Nicaragua has just taken a number of long steps toward democratization—but to comply with the Arias plan, not as a concession to the contras. President Reagan may flippantly say "phooey." But it is a certainty that those steps toward democratization will be rescinded and the Arias plan fatally undermined should Congress approve any contra aid beyond the aid for resettlement purposes permitted by the Arias plan.

In short, President Reagan's policy in Nicaragua not only defies common sense but actually works against our stated objectives. If our nation is not to be dragged along any further on this march of folly, we must depend on the Congress to prevent it by refusing further aid to the contras, except for what might be used in resettling them.

#### UKRAINE UNDER THE U.S.S.R.

### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO,

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, since the loss of Ukrainian sovereignty in the closing days of World War I, millions of individuals have been living under the unasked-for tutelage of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These people, whose homeland is the Ukraine, have often found that their inalienable freedoms as human beings are not respected or that their rights as citizens of the Ukrainian homeland are not recognized.

On Wednesday, January 27, 1988, Ukrainians throughout the world along with the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America celebrated in spirit the 70th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian peoples. But the spirit that these individuals celebrate is that of the human spirit rather than of the political body.

January 27 is a time to remember that the Ukrainian peoples lead lives that are guarded over by the Soviet Government. The expression of national self-determination is completely circumscribed and the ability to profess religious beliefs is blocked at every turn and by every means available.

As a tribute to the spirit of the Ukrainian peoples, January 27 every year serves as a

stark reminder that there is still much to be done to bring to light the plight of the Ukrainian peoples in the struggle for their civil rights.

In the 98th Congress, I introduced legislation establishing the Congressional Commission on the Ukrainian Famine to examine the historical facts behind this famine at the turn of the century. Currently at work on a comprehensive narrative of this period in the history of the Ukrainians' homeland, the Commission is investigating the causes and the consequences of the famine, seeking to understand the tragedy that befell the Ukrainians, the reasons for the famine, and the impact that this famine had on so many individuals.

Today, there is an opportunity through the expression of solidarity with the sentiments of these people to have an impact on their condition for the better.

In the Soviet Union, glasnost has given cautious pause for the possibilities that exist for the Ukrainian peoples and the many other peoples who share in the absence of personal and political freedoms.

In the years to come, perhaps there is hope that the spirit of the Ukraine will burn as brightly as it does with the celebration of this anniversary.

### NAVY SECRETARY JAMES H. WEBB, JR., ADDRESSES THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD, excerpts from an excellent speech made by Secretary James Webb speaking before the National Press Club last month concerning the new times and new challenges we have in the field of national defense.

### NAVY SECRETARY JAMES H. WEBB, JR., ADDRESSES THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

We are not as rich, compared to other nations with whom we are allied, as we were when we sketched out the basic framework of our international military presence just after World War Two. In the decade following that war, our country consistently produced more than 40 percent of the world's Gross Domestic Product. In recent years, that figure has been about 25 percent.

Nor is the Defense Department as well off as it was even a year ago, and the future looks equally difficult. As most of you know, last month the Department of Defense was required to reduce an existing fiscal 1989 budget by more than 33 billion dollars.

We are being told in no uncertain terms, and from many different fronts, that due to fiscal realities the U.S. military of the future must be smaller and more efficient.

We are also hearing, quite frequently and with equal fervor, that in the aftermath of the INF agreements that conventional threats in Europe will be larger, and that conventional force structure there should receive more emphasis.

We also know, and there is no question about this, that our future as a nation is very closely tied to Asia in economic and political terms, and that we must do a better job of attending to the economic, political

and security issues here in our own hemisphere.

And the overriding reality is that it should be obvious that a smaller United States military, no matter how efficient, cannot attend to all of these matters by itself, at least not in the same way that it has over the past 42 years.

The key question for our national leadership as it struggles with these realities is not one program or another in the budget, as has so often been the case, but whether, and how, the United States can maintain its commitments throughout the world, while at the same time reducing the size and force structure of its military.

It is a little bit easier to point out what we cannot do. The first answer is that we cannot do it at all without a great deal of risk, in both diplomatic and military terms. The second, and I have been saying this for much longer than I have been Secretary of the Navy, is that it would be impossible to do it with any degree of effectiveness and at the same time reduce the size of our Navy. And the third answer is that we cannot do it without the increased cooperation and help of our allies.

Allow me to advance the following thoughts as an analytical beginning:

First, although a great deal of energy and money is dedicated to our NATO alliance, and although this alliance is one of the keystones of our military structure, we need to remind ourselves from time to time that we are more than a European nation. We are a global nation with largely European antecedents, continuing European interests, and national loyalties to Western Europe's fundamental objectives. We must remain strong in Europe, but we also have the obligation to view the Soviet military threat in global, rather than regional terms, and to address that threat worldwide.

Second, the United States is becoming more intertwined with Asia, and the issues involving Asia are moving to the forefront in the world community. In 1986 the United States did 219 billion dollars gross trade in Asia, 75 percent more than its gross trade with the Atlantic nations. In economic, cultural and political terms, we are becoming increasingly more tied to Asia, and it is imperative that we match those ties with the military capability to protect our interests and honor our obligations to friends and allies in the region.

The Soviets have achieved the historic Russian dream of owning a warm water port in the Pacific, and on any given day two dozen Soviet ships are in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam, as are fighter, bomber and long range reconnaissance aircraft. They have increased their Far East Command by ten divisions over the last ten years, and now have 530,000 ground troops in East Asia, in addition to another 200,000 spread through Mongolia, the Transbaikal, and Central Asia. The Far East military region has 85 Backfire bombers, and nearly 2,500 combat aircraft. The Soviet Pacific Fleet is now the largest of its four fleets, with 840 warships as opposed to 750 a decade ago. These ships include two Kiev class aircraft carriers, a Kirov class nuclear guided missile cruiser, 41 percent of the heavy surface ships in the entire Soviet navy, 37 percent of the combat aircraft in Soviet naval aviation, 40 percent of all their SSBNs, and extensive amphibious capabilities.

Japan clearly has the resources and the national interest to pick up more of the defense load in Asia. Japan is becoming the largest creditor nation in the world. More

than half of the oil that passes through the Straits of Hormuz goes to Japan. I personally recommended as early as 1973 that Japan include the defense of its sea lanes, even as far as the Indian Ocean, in its constitutional interpretation of "self-defense." Ocean-going activities of that sort would aid in our alliance without inciting the concern of other nations in the region that attended its land occupations of forty-five and fifty years ago.

Third, we must consider the Soviets themselves. No analysis of our own future defense priorities can leave them out. There has been considerable discussion of late regarding changes taking place within the Soviet Union. It would be inappropriate for me, and beyond the scope of this speech, to address these changes in any detail, but two observations seem inescapable. First, Soviet conventional force structure around the world has been growing, and if force structure cuts are to occur in our own military, we must be careful to signal to the Soviets that this is a refinement of our capabilities, rather than a reduction of them. And second, an improved situation in Europe, absent a stand-down of conventional forces taken out of that theater, may well increase rather than decrease Soviet pressure in other areas.

Fourth, we must pay greater attention to our own hemisphere, and to the Third World as a whole. I mentioned that we are becoming more intertwined with Asia, and the same is true with Latin America. This nation's principal movements, in economic, cultural and political terms, are west and south. The changing ethnic makeup of the country itself shows this.

In Latin America, the Soviets operate roughly 7600 military personnel in Cuba, and another 230 in Nicaragua and Peru. During 1986 alone the Soviets provided more than 600 million dollars of equipment to the Sandinista regime as well. The Cubans contribute another 2500 troops in Nicaragua.

The overriding guidepost for the future is that our conventional force structure must provide us the most utility and the most capability in the global arena. This requires versatility in terms of military mission. It means that forces dedicated to static defensive missions must be scrutinized and altered when possible in favor of units that can deploy and fight wherever they are needed.

Our place in the world has been guaranteed by our maritime power, particularly during this century. We are a maritime nation by virtue of our geographic position, economic necessity, and political commitment. American seapower maintains unimpeded access to world markets. It denies our adversaries the use of sea lanes for expansionist or imperialistic reasons. It maintains international security and stability, including protection of those nations whom we count as friends and allies during crisis. It enables us, when war comes, to reinforce allies, to multiply the effectiveness of their armies, to inject our own ground forces when appropriate, to become supreme on the land through control of the sea. It provides us the single greatest deterrent to nuclear war, with a nuclear submarine force that fields one-half of our nuclear capability at one-fourth of the overall cost for the strategic nuclear Triad.

At this moment, of our total fleet of 569 ships, which includes the naval reserve, 157 are at sea, 112 outside of their local operating areas, 91 them forward deployed at po-

tential hot spots around the world. These numbers are actually a bit low, due to the respite of the holiday season.

We need not speculate on what would happen if we cut back naval force structure. Those who claim that the last seven years have shown the greatest peacetime buildup of the U.S. Navy forget that the decade that preceded this buildup gave us the greatest evisceration of the Navy in its history. When I was commissioned in 1968 there were 931 combatants in the U.S. Navy. By the time we inherited the Indian Ocean commitments in 1979, the greatest navy in the world had been cut in half, to a force of only 479 combatants. Operational commitments, so often driven by national command authority needs, did not decrease.

In an ever more complex world environment, and with a U.S. military force structure that we are told will be smaller, we can expect national command authority commitments, or what the budgeters euphemistically call "unprogrammed contingencies," to at least remain the same, and perhaps to increase. It would seem illogical to reduce the size of our sea services at the very moment in history when they should be assuming an even greater role in our international security posture, unless our leaders wish to consciously acknowledge that we will be unable to meet the contingencies of the future.

I would hope that a different decision will be made. I would hope that we will instead have the courage to fully debate the nature of our obligations, as well as the nature of our allies' obligations to us, and to sort out exactly what it is we are defending and how this defense can best be accomplished.

#### THE RAPPELLING WAYS OF COUNCILMAN BOB HOFFMAN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, an American flag and a copy of the U.S. Constitution now rest atop Mount Vinson 16,857 feet above sea level in Antarctica, thanks to the efforts of Bob Hoffman, a city councilman and two-term mayor of Belmont, a community in my district.

Hoffman led a team of six climbers to the top of the mountain, named after the late U.S. Congressman Carl Vinson, a strong proponent of research in Antarctica, in November. From a base camp at a 7,000-foot altitude in the Ellsworth Mountains, the team fought fierce storms and 30 below zero temperatures to reach the summit, the highest on the icy continent. At times, winds gusted to 70 miles per hour, forcing the climbers to build ice walls for protection.

The climb took 2 weeks; Hoffman and his crew spent Thanksgiving inside a tiny tent and ate spaghetti, soup, and tuna. Upon reaching the top, a flag and a copy of the U.S. Constitution presented by this office were left there, as symbols of freedom in a frozen wasteland. By international treaty, no nation lays claim to Antarctica, and all are free to explore its wonders and unlock its secrets.

Why does he climb mountains? Hoffman avoids the usual clichés about "because it is there" and gives an explanation that most

climbers feel. As he told the San Mateo Times:

All of your senses are alive—to be on the edge and flirt with that kind of danger, and be able to succeed—it's a wonderful feeling. Part of the lure is knowing that not a lot of people will ever do it.

Indeed, since Mount Vinson was discovered 30 years ago, only a few expeditions have succeeded in conquering it, the last in 1965. The climb itself is not that difficult by mountaineering standards. What makes Vinson a challenge is its hostile environment and the logistical planning required simply to get in place to climb the mountain.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Bob Hoffman for his efforts, for his spirit and for his adventure, which took a small part of America to a hostile wilderness.

#### TRIBUTE TO MRS. VADA MAY REEL

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand before you today to pay tribute to Mrs. Vada May Reel of Ohio.

Her list of community service is rather impressive. She graduated from Austintown-Fitch High School in 1940 and married Jack Reel 2 years later. She has not missed a Sunday service in 52 years and has played the organ for Sunday worship since she was 14. Mrs. Reel has been a Sunday school teacher, a youth director, a member of the district pastorate, and has been active in local women's societies at both district and conference levels.

Outside the church, Vada May has been a member of the Mahoning County Extension Homemakers Council for 20 years, and had been a member and chairman of the County Extension Advisory Committee. She has served as a Junior Summer Camp Advisor, and has been a Mahoning County Deputy since 1969.

Mrs. Vada May Reel gives a tremendous amount of herself on behalf of the people of Ohio. How honored I am to represent such a generous woman. I pay tribute to her for her endless faith in God and those around her.

#### KLUGMANN: WE ALREADY HAVE A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, so complex and intractable is the Central America problem that there has developed an insatiable appetite for negotiations and dialog of almost any kind. For the moment the Guatemala peace plan is the focus of all attention. But something very important is being left out of these conversations: there already is a negotiated

peace settlement of the Nicaraguan matter. In one sense the real question is whether we intend to live by it.

Elaborate negotiations between the Sandinista front and the Organization of American States and its various members, including the United States, led in 1979 to a binding political agreement about the future of Nicaragua. That future, was to be a democratic one. And in 1985 the Congress passed a law—the International Security and Development Cooperation Act—which declares that U.S. policy will be guided by that agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I made these points in House Concurrent Resolution 41, introduced last February 5. They need to be made again, because in 1987 and 1988 we are debating a matter which we supposedly settled in 1979. I am extremely pleased to learn that Washington Times editorial writer Mark Klugmann has been doing a great deal of research into the background of the 1979 settlement, and has published a new article which draws upon that work. It makes most valuable reading, and I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 26, 1988]

**CARTER'S UNFULFILLED DEAL**  
(By Mark Klugmann)

The crisis in Nicaragua has a forgotten history. It is the negotiated settlement by which the United States helped install Nicaragua's Sandinista government in 1979.

That this agreement has been virtually absent from the Nicaraguan debate is most unfortunate, but all too typical of America's failure to assert or enforce its past diplomatic solutions.

For example, U.S. officials rightly criticize Fidel Castro's on-going support for subversion in a dozen countries—but they rarely cite the stipulation of the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement that bars Cuba from exporting revolution.

Similarly, Eastern Europe, Vietnam, human rights in the Soviet bloc, and other areas of concern are addressed by never-fulfilled, never-enforced negotiated agreements.

But in a key respect, the 1979 Nicaragua settlement is different. Some past agreements have faded from sight because they deal with bygone issues or because the United States has no appetite or instrument for enforcing them. But with the Nicaragua settlement, the issue is current and the enforcement policy—support for the freedom fighters—is already being carried out. Ironically, it is only the settlement which has been disremembered.

Back on July 20, 1979, the day after the Sandinistas took power, a standard news summary. Facts on File, would matter-of-factly write: "The U.S. negotiated an agreement with the leaders of the FSLN [the Sandinista party] while pressing Somoza to resign. When the FSLN had conceded a number of points that the U.S. felt were necessary to insure that the new government would not be dominated by communist sympathizers, Somoza was told that he could step down." The account would refer to "the plans for a peaceful transfer of power that had been painstakingly negotiated by [U.S. Amb.] Lawrence A. Pezzullo, the five-member rebel junta and Somoza."

But despite the record, diplomatic amnesia has set in. And as a result the Nicaragua issue is often misreported, as in a recent As-

sociated Press story that termed the central policy question "whether the United States should be sponsoring a rebel force aimed at destabilizing a foreign government." Memories may fade, but facts don't.

The real question is whether the Sandinistas will be forced to comply with the negotiated settlement that legitimized them and enabled them to take power.

U.S. policy in Nicaragua is at a critical point. With the failure of the Arias plan to bring either peace or democracy to Nicaragua and with Congress scheduled to vote on new aid to the freedom fighters early next month, it is time to re-examine the still valid and binding 1979 negotiated settlement and restore the agreement to the primary role it deserves in public debate.

At minimum, it is essential to a truthful accounting of how we got where we are today. And it could hold the political key to renewing aid to the Nicaraguan resistance and removing the Sandinistas' brutal Marxist-Leninist regime.

Until recently, the Reagan administration made little mention of the 1979 settlement. Presidential speeches would briefly mention the Sandinistas' "broken promises," failing to explain that these commitments were part of a negotiated settlement that addressed political, security and human rights issues.

The Democrats in 1979 were not so modest about their accomplishment. In June of that year, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and other senators pressing the Jimmy Carter administration on Nicaragua said plainly that their goal was ouster of President Anastasio Somoza and "a political settlement in Nicaragua."

President Carter's deputy secretary of State, Warren Christopher, candidly wrote to Mr. Kennedy three weeks before the Sandinistas were installed that "we are engaged in a wide-ranging diplomatic effort in Washington, in Managua and throughout the hemisphere. Our goal is a process which would remove Somoza peacefully and would lead to . . . the establishment of a new representative government."

The State Department, after Mr. Somoza's resignation and departure from Nicaragua, credited itself with having "worked to facilitate a peaceful and democratic solution." Mr. Carter, once Mr. Somoza was out and the Sandinista-dominated junta was in, boasted of having "[brought] about an orderly transition."

Mr. Carter later hosted Daniel Ortega at the White House and with the support of Congress provided \$118 million in direct U.S. aid and led the world community in assembling a \$1.6 billion financial package for Nicaragua's new government.

The Carter administration, with the support of liberal congressional Democrats, had cut off military, economic and political support from Mr. Somoza as he battled the Sandinista insurgency in order to force him to accept a settlement. As Nicaragua's civil war grew in intensity, the U.S. government conducted negotiations with the Somoza government, the communist Sandinistas, the genuinely democratic opposition to Mr. Somoza, and the Organization of American States.

The objectives of the Carter administration were codified on June 23, 1979, when the OAS passed a resolution calling for the "immediate and definitive replacement of the Somoza regime" and "the installation in Nicaraguan territory of a democratic government" that would honor "human rights," hold "free elections," and guarantee

"peace, freedom and justice." This resolution was a request for a new government willing to meet certain political specifications. The Government of National Reconstruction junta—the Sandinista-dominated government-in-waiting—had positioned itself to fill that role by crafting a democratic facade and actively campaigning and negotiating with the United States and other OAS member states.

With Mr. Somoza still in power, Mr. Carter's envoys met repeatedly with the GNR junta to negotiate specific democratic requirements and, ultimately, finalize a plan for installing the five-member GNR junta. On July 12, 1979, a spokesman for the GNR junta said their talks with the United States had "reached the final stages." That same day, the GNR junta sent a cable to the OAS acknowledging the June 23 resolution and presenting their "Plan to Achieve Peace"—which they described as developed on the basis of the resolution—and the "Program of the Junta of the GNR."

The letter and attachments committed the junta to "free elections," "a broad-based democratic government," "full respect for human rights," "fundamental liberties," "freedom of religion," "union rights," "a mixed economy," "an independent foreign policy of non-alignment" and a "minimum" permanent military corps, among other specifics.

On July 15, 1979, the United States gave its approval to the GNR junta, based on the specific commitments received on July 12, and final plans were made for Mr. Somoza's resignation and the transfer of power.

The political settlement reached with the Sandinistas in 1979 is still unfulfilled, but the terms are good, guaranteeing real democracy and human rights for the people of Nicaragua—which, after all, was the objective of the American intervention against Mr. Somoza.

The settlement also fully protects the security of Central America and the United States by precluding Nicaragua from aiding communist guerrillas in Central America, basing thousands of Soviet bloc, Cuban, Palestine Liberation Organization, and Libyan military and intelligence personnel in Nicaragua or building a military capability greater than that of all its neighbors combined—which the Sandinistas have done.

The 1979 settlement must be enforced and complied with. Without the political settlement, the Sandinistas would not have gained power. And if the agreement is enforced, the United States' policy requirement of a genuinely democratic, peaceful Nicaragua will be satisfied and the yearning of the Nicaraguan people for democracy and freedom, expressed in their opposition to both the Somoza dictatorship and the Sandinista communists, will at long last be fulfilled.

But that is only part of what the settlement negotiated between the Carter administration and the Sandinistas does: It also recasts the American political debate over Nicaragua's communist regime, shifting the burden to the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, which helped bring the Sandinistas to power and which, most importantly, has opposed aiding the Nicaraguan resistance and enforcing the settlement.

Opponents of Contra aid have insisted that they are not defenders of the Sandinistas, they simply want a negotiated settlement.

The reality is that we already have a satisfactory negotiated settlement, and the Democratic Party is chiefly responsible for

it. The agreement provides everything we require. The Sandinistas are not honoring it. The Contras are fighting to fulfill it. Some members of Congress are working to erase it.

Congressional liberals have for too long hidden behind a false choice by saying they seek a diplomatic solution, not a military solution.

The reality is that the Contras' armed struggle is not instead of a negotiated settlement, it is in enforcement of the settlement President Carter reached.

For Congress to terminate the Contras before the Sandinistas comply is effectively to convert the United States' 1979 intervention and settlement from a pro-democratic undertaking into one that served only to advance Soviet communism to the mainland of North America.

The failure of the Arias plan to deliver what it promised has focused renewed attention on the 1979 agreement. President Reagan, speaking last October before the OAS, bluntly stated that "there already exists a negotiated settlement with the Sandinistas that pre-dates the Guatemala plan—the settlement of 1979 . . . each nation here is a party to that negotiated settlement."

When it was Daniel Ortega's turn to speak to the OAS last November, he spent half his speech trying to escape the grip of the 1979 agreement, arguing a defense reminiscent of the man accused of murder who claimed he was out of town when it happened and, besides, he had acted in self-defense.

Mr. Ortega began by denying "the supposed violation of an in-existent commitment," then switched to arguing that "even supposing that such a political pledge had had the force of a legal commitment, it could not have justified the United States insisting [on] the fulfillment of the commitment made not directly toward the United States."

(Of course, Commandante Ortega knows that the Sandinistas made their democratic commitments directly to the United States: He personally participated in the 1979 negotiating sessions. And both Daniel Ortega and Sergio Ramirez, his vice president, signed the July 12, 1979, written commitments.)

Both congressional liberals and the Sandinista Marxists have used the Arias plan in an effort to defund the resistance and prevent their enforcement of the 1979 settlement. The Arias plan's concept of disarming and evicting the resistance today in exchange for promises of "democratization" tomorrow is utterly flawed and unenforceable.

By contrast, in 1979, Costa Rica provided both weapons and sanctuary to Sandinista guerrillas while democracy for Nicaragua was negotiated in San Jose; meanwhile, it was the dictator in Managua whose arms supplies were cut off and not the rebels. No Central American president—certainly not Daniel Ortega—has the authority to sign away the legitimate claim of every Nicaraguan to the fundamental democratic rights provided under the 1979 settlement.

But at this point the shortcomings of the Arias plan are largely beside the point: The Arias plan's stipulations on human rights and democratization have not been honored by the Sandinistas, and the 90- and 150-day deadlines have each passed and been ignored.

What remains is what we have always had: the 1979 settlement, a group of brave Nicaraguans struggling to fulfill it, and a

Communist regime determined to hold and expand its power in Central America.

Indeed, the Burton Amendment to the 1985 Foreign Assistance Act requires that U.S. policy in Nicaragua must be governed by the terms of the 1979 settlement. And after two Arias deadlines, three years of Contradora deliberations, many rounds of bilateral negotiations and numerous visits of congressional delegations, it has become quite clear: There is no other sound basis for U.S. policy besides the 1979 settlement.

When the Reagan administration asks Congress to renew aid to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance the message should be this: We have a binding negotiated settlement with the Sandinistas that guarantees true liberal democracy for the people of Nicaragua and assures the security of Central America and the United States. Under the auspices of the OAS, the settlement was achieved by a Democratic president with a Democratic Congress. The United States is morally obligated to enforce it, and our national security requires that we do.

If the Democrats now want to repudiate their own settlement rather than enforce it against a brutal and expansionist pro-Soviet communist dictatorship on the mainland of North America, let them tell the American people why.

Come November, the electorate will have a clear choice.

#### **EASTERN ORANGE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MAKES GREAT STRIDES IN 1987**

**HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 1, 1988*

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to the Eastern Orange County Chamber of Commerce, of Newburgh, NY, and its president, Dr. John D'Ambrosio, and its board chairman, Ian Van der Essen, for the outstanding gains the organization made in 1987, gains that benefit the entire community.

Having tripled in size since 1982, the chamber broke the 1,000-member mark during the past year and it now has the largest membership of any chamber of commerce between Albany and Westchester County.

Innovation is the mark of this organization. Economic development efforts by the Eastern Orange County Chamber created hundreds of new jobs in 1987. It is the only chamber in the mid-Hudson Valley with a full-time economic development staff to help existing business expand and new business relocate to the area.

The chamber's service corps of retired executives numbers 200 strong. Through this program, volunteer retired executives are available every Tuesday morning to consult with individuals thinking of starting their own business or those with a business running into trouble. This service is free and confidential.

Other services to members include the Eastern Orange County Chamber of Commerce health insurance program with over 1,000 participants from over 300 companies enrolled. Monthly membership breakfasts and mixers attract enthusiastic participation. The

chamber publicizes the services of member organizations and eagerly participates in groundbreakings, grand openings and special community celebrations.

The four goals of the Eastern Orange Chamber of Commerce are economic development, increased tourism, improved public relations and membership development. The chamber has made great strides in the past year, and I have complete confidence that growth and expansion will continue through 1988.

#### **THE LOSS OF PRESIDENT CHIANG CHING-KUO**

**HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 1, 1988*

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the news of President Chiang's death on January 13, 1988, was a shock to the people on Taiwan, and they mourn his passing.

Chiang left behind an island country enjoying economic prosperity. Just as importantly he left behind a populace edging slowly but surely toward a fuller democracy.

Indeed, Chiang's greatest legacy may be the political reforms begun in the final 12 months of his life. He lifted martial law, he allowed opposition political parties to exist, he relaxed controls of newspapers, he permitted Taiwan residents to visit their relatives on the mainland, and he considered overhauling the legislature. Reform of this electoral system remains undone, leaving large numbers of people without equal representation. This should be an absolute priority of the new administration.

Chiang's political initiatives, though belated, have begun to transform how his people think and act. Despite open political demonstrations by the opposition political party which greatly irritated the conservative segments of society, Chiang, in his will, drafted 9 days before his death, expressed his wish:

It is . . . my hope that you actively carry out constitutional democratic development without interruption.

We in this country hope that the pace of democratization will now quicken on Taiwan under the leadership of President Lee Teng-hui. There should be no excuses, and no turning back.

#### **HAIL TO THE REDSKINS**

**HON. STAN PARRIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 1, 1988*

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Washington Redskins scored a stunning upset of the Denver Broncos in Super Bowl XXII.

Not only did the Redskins surprise all of the so-called experts by winning, but in the course of that victory they broke five team records and nine individual ones.

These records include:

Team: total yards, 602; most yards rushing, 280; touchdowns, 6; most touchdowns in a quarter, 5; most points quarter, 35.

Individual: yards rushing, Timmy Smith, 204; yards passing, Doug Williams, 340; yards receiving, Ricky Sanders, 193; most combined yards, Ricky Sanders, 235; longest completion, Williams to Sanders, 80 yards (tied record); touchdown passes, Doug Williams, 4 (tied record); touchdowns rushing, Timmy Smith, 2 (tied record); touchdowns receiving, Ricky Sanders, 2 (tied record); point-after-touchdowns, Ali Haji-Sheikh, 6.

Not only were all of these records set, but football fans were treated to the most outstanding quarter in all of professional football history. These records really serve to emphasize what a team effort the Redskins' victory was. Outstanding defense, including five sacks of the quarterback and three interceptions, and brilliant play by the offensive line made it possible for Doug Williams, Timmy Smith, and Ricky Sanders to enter the record books.

Who would have thought that a rookie running back who didn't even know he was starting would break all the records for Super Bowl rushing—rushing in fact for more yards than he did throughout the regular season? Who would have thought that the top quarterback from the AFC would only complete about a third of his passes and be intercepted and sacked continually? Who would have thought that Doug Williams, despite root canal surgery on Saturday and a knee injury in the first quarter, would break all of the Super Bowl records for a quarterback?

Well, the only ones who could have known were those of us here in Washington, DC, who have learned that the essence of the Redskins' success was not individual raw talent, or a set of competing egos, but the process of teamwork, where the sum of the individual players exceeded the expectations of almost everyone.

What I love most about the Redskins, however, goes beyond whether or not they win or lose—although winning is infinitely preferable. The Redskins do more to unite the people of the Washington metropolitan area than anything else. When the Redskins are playing, Republicans and Democrats, Virginians and Marylanders, even Walter Fauntroy and myself, all band together to cheer the burgundy and gold on to victory.

Why do the Redskins' unite this city? It is because the Redskins' success is based on the principles all of us admire. Unity in the face of a tough opponent, spirit in the face of predictions of defeat, and a confidence not built around reliance on only oneself, but reliance on each other.

Mr. Speaker, this city is floating on air today, and good feelings are running high. Just about everyone is in a good mood—besides a certain Western State delegation which shall remain nameless—thanks to the victory of a hard-working bunch of football players who showed us what teamwork can do. Let's take advantage of this wonderful time to show what a little teamwork could do around here in Congress. Maybe we might upset the economic experts and set a few deficit-busting records ourselves.

# CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL NOTES CZECHOSLOVAKIAN CHARTER 77 GROUP'S CALL FOR HUMAN RIGHTS SOLIDARITY WITH THE ROMANIAN PEOPLE

## HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues are familiar with the noted Czechoslovakian dissident group called charter 77. Indeed, many of us have joined together on various occasions to support them in their efforts on behalf of civil and political liberties for the people of Czechoslovakia.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with Charter 77 to call attention to the human rights violations suffered by the people of Romania. Last month, Charter 77 called for a day of protest outside Romanian embassies throughout Europe today, February 1, in solidarity with the hardships suffered by Romanians under President Nicolae Ceausescu.

In their statement in support of the Romanian people, Charter 77 observed:

Romania is a curious country: not only does its government deny its citizens elementary liberties to an extent which has no parallel in any other Soviet Bloc country, but it is not even capable of ensuring what the communist regimes call their "greatest achievement", the basic material and job security, which these regimes use as a means of self-legitimation.

The Charter 77 statement noted the lack of proper heating in Romanian apartments and offices during the harsh winter, and the fact that Romanians are allowed only two 40-watt light bulbs per apartment. In addition, basic foodstuffs, such as flour, sugar, and meat, are still rationed—43 years after World War II ended—or are not available at all.

Charter 77 also called attention to the sense of despair that has driven Romanian workers to riots and demonstrations. Last November, several thousand protesters demonstrated against the Ceausescu regime in Brasov. They ransacked the local Communist Party headquarters, destroyed portraits of Ceausescu, and painted antiregime slogans on buildings. The incidents sprang from protests against the management of the Red Flag tractor factory, where workers' pay had been reduced, dismissals had been scheduled, and day workers were told to work evenings to fulfill quotas. New accounts stated that some workers also were protesting food energy shortages.

It is estimated that 400 people were arrested in Brasov. Some of those arrested were reported to have been beaten. Reliable reports indicate that some 60 of the Brasov demonstrators still are being held in prison. As we recall the suffering of the Romanian people today in solidarity with Charter 77, it is appropriate to remember especially these prisoners and to call upon the Romanian Government to release them immediately without condition.

The Charter 77 statement points out that in well-heated and well-lit conference halls, people "tend to forget there is a country in

Europe where people have neither heat nor light." Therefore, Charter 77 is calling for others in the world to try to live for a day in an unheated or badly lit apartment, and to try to deny themselves at least for a single day of "all those things that form our material living standard and that are permanently denied to the Romanians."

The plight of the people of Romania under the Ceausescu regime is well-known to Congress. Both the House and the Senate have passed amendments to the trade bill to lift "most-favored-nation" trade status to the Romanian Government for 6 months to protest that nation's human rights abuses. The amendments call special attention to the repression of religion by the Ceausescu government and the mistreatment of ethnic minorities, particularly the ethnic Hungarian minority. The Ceausescu government seems determined to stifle the activities of the Christian churches and to destroy the identity and cultural heritage of the Hungarians living in Romania.

I urge my colleagues to renew their support for human rights in Romania by asking the conferees on the trade bill to back the temporary suspension of MFN to Romania. In addition, I call upon my colleagues to ask President Reagan not to renew the annual extension of MFN to Romania this year.

In the meantime, let us join with Charter 77 this week to reflect on the suffering of the Romanian people and to rededicate ourselves to initiatives to help bring to them liberty and respect for basic human rights.

## ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S "GUEST SPEAKERS PROGRAM"

### HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 1, 1988

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the St. Bartholomew School of Elmhurst, NY, for its commitment to a quality education for its students.

Last year, I had the pleasure of being the first public figure to participate in St. Bartholomew's "guest speakers program." This program introduces the students to interesting people from all walks of life.

This year, the school established a constitution and representative council for its first through eighth grade students. I was honored to help administer the oaths of office to the council at the inaugural ceremonies on January 29, 1988.

The principal of the school, Sister Margaret Schmit, and Mr. Thomas Straczynsky, who teaches social studies, have provided the guiding light of leadership in helping the students of St. Bartholomew's get an education beyond the classroom by challenging them to learn through participation.

This determination to expand the knowledge and interests of students is an example for other schools to emulate and deserves recognition.

I wish to congratulate Msgr. James Goltimer, the staff, and the students of "St.

Bart's" on this achievement, and wish them many more years of success.

## CENTRAL AMERICA'S PEACE ACCORD

**HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 1, 1988*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, the five Central American presidents met in San Jose, Costa Rica, to consider progress made to date under the Central American Peace Accord signed this past summer in Guatemala.

This important meeting marked a watershed in the recent history of the region and clearly demonstrated the Central American leader's firm desire and commitment to continuing the peace process. Today, I join a number of my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee in introducing a resolution supporting these efforts, congratulating the Central American presidents, and most importantly, calling upon all parties to the Guatemala accord to meet fully all their obligations under the accord.

In their final communique, the Central American presidents realized that while progress toward peace had been made, much more needed to be done. They therefore committed their governments "unconditionally and unilaterally to total compliance, without excuses."

The Congress can support these leaders in their struggle to end the wars that plague the region. We can encourage their path to promote democracy and to build and strengthen democratic institutions in each country. The San Jose meeting marked another milestone in that struggle and should be recognized accordingly.

## THIRTY-FOUR MAJOR LATIN AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL PARTIES CALL ON CONGRESS TO REJECT CONTRA AID

**HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 1, 1988*

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the following documents: First, a memorandum from the Commission on United States-Latin American Relations transmitting a resolution of the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America and the Latin American Human Rights Association concerning the Guatemala peace process and Contra aid; second, a letter of transmittal from the executive secretary of the conference; and third, the text of the resolution itself.

The resolution implores this Congress in unmistakable terms to put an end to Contra aid. I hope we will heed their call. The material follows:

COMMISSION ON UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS,  
Washington, DC, January 28, 1988.

Re: Major Latin American political parties oppose Contra aid in message to U.S. Congress.

To: Members of Congress, the National Republican Party, the National Democratic Party 1988 Presidential candidates, members of the press.

From: Robert E. White, president, International Center for Development Policy; and Melinda DeLashmutt, director, Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations

At a joint conference in Lima, Peru on Jan. 22-23, the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America (COPPPAL) and the Latin American Human Rights Association (ALDHU) urged the Congress of the United States to reject all aid to the contras. The conference resolution described the request for aid to contra forces in Nicaragua as a violation of the most elemental norms of international law and a threat to the efforts made thus far towards peace in the region.

The COPPPAL represents 34 major democratic political parties, including nine ruling parties. They make up 7 of the 8 governments within the Contadora and Support Group countries.<sup>1</sup> The ALDHU is a leading non-governmental organization in Latin America focusing on defense of human rights.

The attached letter and resolution for the U.S. Congress were given to representatives of the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations, official observers at the Lima conference, by the Executive Secretary of COPPPAL. The letter states in part:

"Within their resolution, both organizations urge the Congress of the United States to reject the request (for aid to the contras), thereby demonstrating its support in the search for political solutions and peaceful coexistence in the hemisphere. \*\*\* To heed the calls presented by both organizations will not only go in favor of a stable peace in Central America but will also contribute to an improved coexistence with other countries of the continent."

The COPPPAL resolution reminds us that the Reagan administration policy in Central America has no democratic allies in Latin America.

The time has come to acknowledge that Latin America has a legitimate voice in the future of democracy and regional security. It is past time that we hear that voice.

The Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations asks members of Congress and others involved in the contra aid debate to take into account these documents which reflect the majority voice of our Latin American neighbors.

For more information, call the Commission office at 202/547-3800.

COPPPAL,  
January 27, 1988.

On January 22nd and 23rd, 1988, the eighth meeting of the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America (COPPPAL) was held in Lima, Peru. This meeting was held jointly with the Latin American Human Rights Association to discuss common interests. The principal issues discussed were:

(a) The evaluation and development of the peace efforts that began in Esquipulas II (Guatemala).

(b) The evaluation and development of the democratization process in the southern cone of Latin America.

We have the pleasure of sending you the attached Resolution that was unanimously adopted by our organization after final deliberation of the efforts in search of negotiated political solutions for a reasonable, honorable and just peace plan to ensure the countries and people of Central America long lasting peace.

Given that within this painful regional drama that are institutions of the United States involved, this Resolution includes a decision to send a copy to the Congress and the Democratic and Republican parties. Through this letter we respectfully request the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations to present this Resolution to its destination in the United States.

For such purposes, I believe it is important to inform you that COPPPAL (the Permanent Conference of Political Parties of Latin America) is a forum that constitutes 34 significant political parties of 20 nations in Latin America and the Caribbean. Nine of these parties are in government in their countries and others have a possibility of becoming so within the next month. Seven are (in government) within the so-called "Group of Eight", which encompasses the nations of the Contadora Group and its Support Group. The large majority are parties that have significant representation in the congresses of their countries. Where there still exist dictatorships, these parties are among the main forces of the democratic opposition.

The Latin American Human Rights Association (ALDHU) is composed of well known personalities of the academic, artistic and political circles from the majority of the countries of the region, with a meritorious record of serving in the defense and development of Human Rights. We are therefore referring to two organizations with a wide representation.

During these years, COPPPAL and ALDHU have held several meetings in which they have analyzed the problems of Central America, expressing upon many occasions their support for a just and honorable, peaceful solution that guarantees a peaceful coexistence and the development of democracy in the region. Their knowledge of the realities of the region has led them to reiterate that such goals are possible within the framework of the Contadora initiatives and the spirit of Esquipulas II.

Today, as we examine how the situation has evolved in the last months, both organizations concur with the recent report of the International Commission of Verification and Follow-up (C.I.S.V.)—as mandated by Esquipulas II—that "the policy and practice of the Government of the United States of furnishing assistance, military in particular, to the irregular forces that operate against the Government of Nicaragua," constitutes a policy of intervention. Therefore COPPPAL and ALDHU express their profound disagreement with the request for aid for the "Contras" soon to be considered by the U.S. Congress as a violation of International Law and as a threat that can make the efforts undertaken for peace to date, fail.

As a consequence, as part of its Resolution, both organizations call upon the Congress of the United States to reject the request for aid and to demonstrate its support in the search of political solutions and

<sup>1</sup> Mexico, Brazil, Uruguay, Peru, Panama, Venezuela and Colombia.

peaceful coexistence in the Hemisphere. At the same time, this is an appeal to all the countries in the area to impede the traffic of arms through their territories and the use of it for aggression against other states. It is also a call for a withdrawal of foreign military forces and advisers from Central America and to cease all military aid to the Governments and forces in the region.

While this Resolution does not explicitly condemn acts of aggression which violate both international and inter-American law, it does call attention to the forebodings of Latin American and Caribbean nations removed from the immediate zone of conflict. In their view, intervention not only sets a bad precedent, it raises profound fears for the future. Therefore, to take into consideration the Resolution approved by COPPPAL and ALDHU would not only help to bring about peace in Central America but would also contribute to improved relations with the nations of the continent.

Thanking you for your valuable attention given to our request so that this Resolution may be taken into consideration by members of Congress and by the leadership of the two major parties of the United States, we reiterate to you and to the Commission on U.S.-Latin American Relations our sincere gratitude.

For the Board of COPPPAL,

NILS CASTRO,  
Executive Secretary.

#### RESOLUTION ON THE PROGRESS OF THE PEACE EFFORT INITIATED WITH ESQUIPULAS II

The Permanent Conference of Latin American Political Parties (COPPPAL), and the Latin American Human Rights Association (ALDHU), meeting in Lima, Peru, on January 22 and 23, 1988, Resolves:

To make clear our concern with regard to the obstacles and pressures confronting the peace efforts in Central America, which are still fragile; but also to express our conviction that an indispensable element in overcoming the present crisis is the continuity and compliance with all the commitments made by all the governments of the region;

To give unrestricted support to the agreements which emerged from the meeting of Central American Presidents, known as "Esquipulas II" and to recognize the important role played by the Contadora and the Support Groups whose mediation could prove vital for the establishment of peace in the area.

To express our profound disagreement with the request for aid to the "Contra" forces in Nicaragua, soon to be examined in the United States Congress, since it violates the most elemental norms of international law and threatens to abort the efforts made so far towards peace in the region. In this regard, COPPPAL urges the United States Congress not to approve this request, as a sign of its support in the search for political solutions to ensure peaceful coexistence in the Hemisphere.

To express our satisfaction with the work carried out by the International Commission of Verification and Follow-Up which has carried out the task it was set for, and to place on record our view that this commission should continue to contribute to the peace efforts through "In Situ" inspections to verify, control and follow up all commitments contained in the "Esquipulas II" Procedure.

To urge all the countries in the area to prevent arms traffic in their territories, in accordance with clause 6 of the above men-

tioned Procedure, as well as the use of their territory to attack other States.

To demand the withdrawal of foreign troops and military advisers from the Central American region and the suspensions of all military aid to governments and forces in the region;

To invite the Central American Governments to make every effort to achieve national reconciliation, democratization, cease fire and the fulfilment and supervision of their commitments.

To call on all parties involved to continue with the negotiations on all outstanding issues concerned with security, verification and control of the Contadora Act.

To call on all the parties involved, either directly or indirectly, to join their efforts in favour of peace and development with renewed goodwill and in a spirit of cooperation.

To send a Note to the United States Congress and the Republican and Democratic Parties, which summarizes the contents of this Resolution as an annex to the Note.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 2, 1988, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### FEBRUARY 3

9:00 a.m.

##### Armed Services

To continue hearings on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, focusing on NATO force deficiencies and improvements.

SR-325

9:30 a.m.

##### Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on the nomination of Wendy L. Gramm, of Texas, to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SR-332

##### Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

#### Rules and Administration

To continue hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1988.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

#### Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings to review recent developments in the securities markets, focusing on events surrounding the stock market crash of 1987.

SD-538

#### Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

#### Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider S. 1904, Polygraph Protection Act of 1987, S. 1950, Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects Act of 1987, and the nomination of Thomas G. Pownall, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship & Excellence in Education Foundation, Esther K. Everett, of New York, and Helen J. Valerio, of Massachusetts, each to be a Member of the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, Carolyn Reid-Wallace, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, and Robert L. McElrath, of Tennessee, and J. Wade Gilley, of Virginia, each to be a Member of the National Advisory Council on Educational Research and Improvement.

SD-430

#### Select on Intelligence

Closed business meeting.

SH-219

10:30 a.m.

#### Judiciary

#### Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 951, to establish the Federal Courts Study Commission on the future of the Federal Judiciary.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

#### Environment and Public Works

#### Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1934, to provide for the construction of a Federal office building adjacent to Union Station in Washington, D.C. to consolidate certain judicial branch offices.

SD-406

#### Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

#### Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

## FEBRUARY 4

9:00 a.m.  
Armed Services  
To continue hearings on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, focusing on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance, NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. SR-325

9:30 a.m.  
Energy and Natural Resources  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366

Finance  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Sydney J. Olson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services. SD-215

Judiciary  
Business meeting, to consider pending committee business. SD-226

Rules and Administration  
To continue hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1988. SR-301

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue hearings to review recent developments in the securities markets, focusing on events surrounding the stock market crash of 1987. SD-538

Environment and Public Works  
Environmental Protection Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the oil spill on the Monongahela and Ohio Rivers. SD-406

Finance  
To resume hearings on how to improve the existing welfare system and how to promote the well-being of families with children. SD-215

Foreign Relations  
To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-216

2:00 p.m.  
Armed Services  
To continue hearings in closed session on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense. SR-222

3:00 p.m.  
Budget  
To hold hearings to review the Congressional Budget Office annual report. SD-608

## FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.  
Joint Economic  
To hold hearings on employment-unemployment statistics for January. SD-628

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue hearings to review recent developments in the securities markets, focusing on events surrounding the stock market crash of 1987. SD-538

Foreign Relations  
European Affairs Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-216

Labor and Human Resources  
Labor Subcommittee  
To resume hearings to review practices and operations under the National Labor Relations Act. SD-430

## FEBRUARY 16

2:00 p.m.  
Select on Intelligence  
To resume closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-219

## FEBRUARY 17

2:00 p.m.  
Select on Intelligence  
To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-219

## FEBRUARY 18

10:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
Environmental Protection Subcommittee  
Superfund and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee  
To hold joint hearings on the implementation of Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, including issues related to ocean disposal. SD-406

2:00 p.m.  
Select on Intelligence  
To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-219

## FEBRUARY 19

10:00 a.m.  
Select on Intelligence  
To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11). SH-219

## FEBRUARY 22

10:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. SD-406

2:00 p.m.  
Office of Technology Assessment  
The Board, to meet to consider pending business items. EF-100, Capitol

## FEBRUARY 23

9:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Disabled American Veterans. SD-106

## FEBRUARY 24

9:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blind Veterans Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veterans of World War I. SR-325

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988. SD-538

## FEBRUARY 25

8:00 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees. SR-418

10:00 a.m.  
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To continue hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988. SD-538

## MARCH 2

10:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Environmental Protection Agency. SD-406

## MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
Business meeting, to consider President's budget requests for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees. SR-418

10:00 a.m.  
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings on S. 1848, to authorize a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce. SR-253

## MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.  
Veterans' Affairs  
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. SD-106

## MARCH 14

10:00 a.m.  
Finance

Private Retirement Plans and Oversight  
of the Internal Revenue Service Sub-  
committee  
To hold hearings on the reform of Inter-  
nal Revenue Service code penalties.  
SD-215

## MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Aviation Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on activities  
of the Federal Aviation Administra-  
tion.  
SR-253

## MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs  
Oversight of Government Management  
Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings to examine  
how the Federal Government can

insure the quality of medical tests per-  
formed in clinical laboratories.  
SD-342

## MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs  
Oversight of Government Management  
Subcommittee  
To continue oversight hearings to exam-  
ine how the Federal Government can  
insure the quality of medical tests per-  
formed in clinical laboratories.  
SD-342

## MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings on proposed legislation  
relating to agent orange and related  
issues.  
SR-418

## APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs  
Oversight of Government Management  
Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed legislation  
authorizing funds for programs of the  
Ethics in Government Act.  
SD-342

## APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs  
Oversight of Government Management  
Subcommittee  
To continue hearings on proposed legis-  
lation authorizing funds for programs  
of the Ethics in Government Act.  
SD-342